DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 159 SP 027 183

AUTHOR Sarason, Seymour; And Others
TITLE Fulfilling the Promise: A Fresh Look at Collaboration and Resource Sharing in Education. Pathways to Growth.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 85
CONTRACT 400-83-0005
NOTE 65p.; For the other documents in this set, see SP 027 182-184.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Planning; Educational Resources; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Participative Decision Making; *Public Schools; *Resource Allocation; School Districts; State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Resource Sharing

ABSTRACT

Three crucial factors which have inhibited past school improvement efforts are analyzed in this paper. These factors include: (1) promising more than can be delivered; (2) failing to effectively deal with the reality of limited resources; and (3) failing to recognize and initiate opportunities for collaboration and resource sharing. The paper specifically focuses on the promise of the third factor--collaboration and resource sharing--to illustrate its tremendous potential for improving the quality of education for America's youth. Three case studies of comprehensive, successful collaborative arrangements serve as illustrations. This document is one of three publications making up the Pathways to Growth series, designed to assist school leaders in planning and implementing organizational growth in the schools. (LR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265159

PATHWAYS TO GROWTH

EXPANDING the ROLE of the TEACHER

COLLABORATION and RESOURCE SHARING

PROACTIVE PLANNING

SP 027183

by
Seymour Sarason, Ph.D.
Joseph T. Pascarelli, Ed.D.
and
Leslie Crohn

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

FULFILLING THE PROMISE:

A FRESH LOOK AT COLLABORATION

AND RESOURCE SHARING IN EDUCATION

by

Seymour Sarason, Ph.D.
Joseph T. Pascarelli, Ed.D.
and
Leslie Crohn

Prepared for the Northwest Regional Exchange
Director: Joseph T. Pascarelli

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S. W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone (503) 248-6800

November 1985

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-83-0005 of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

CONTENTS

		Page
	PREFACE	i
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE CONTEXT OF COLLABORATION AND RESOURCE SHARING	4
III.	THE DANGER OF PROMISING TOO MUCH	8
IV.	THE REALITY OF LIMITED RESOURCES	14
V.	THE BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION AND RESOURCE SHARING	18
VI.	THREE CASE STUDIES MATCHED TO THE 15 KEY FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATION	30
VII.	LOOKING AHEAD	45
VIII.	REFERENCES	50
APPENDIX A:	Summary of Research	A1-A7

PREFACE

As a way of addressing the rich variety of educational themes emerging throughout the Northwest region, the Northwest Regional Exchange has been producing a collection of knowledge synthesis products over the past several years. These publications have served to summarize the most current and salient literature and research findings on a number of topics particularly relevant to educators in Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Alaska, and Hawaii. These publications, produced at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory include, in part:

Global Education: State of the Art (1983)

Designing Excellence in Secondary Vocational Education (1983)

Toward Excellence: Student and Teacher Behaviors as Predictors of School Success (1983)

The Call for School Reform (1983)

State Level Goverance: Agenda for New Business or Old? (1983)

Providing Effective Technical Assistance in Educational Settings (1983)

Equitable Schooling Opportunity in a Multicultural Milieu (1983)

"Pathways to Growth" represents a new direction for us. Three distinct yet interrelated topics are combined to form a set of materials which, when viewed as a unit, offer the greatest potential for assisting policy makers, administrators, and other school personnel as they go about the process of organizational growth, or as some would say, as they go about

the process of school improvement. The materials in "Pathways to Growth" include:

The Expanding Role of the Teacher: A Synthesis of Practice and Research

This paper looks at the ways in which the role of the teacher is expanding in schools across the country. The authors present the reasons behind such changes in the roles and responsibilities assigned to teachers and describe places where teachers are actually carrying out these expanded roles. The knowledge base which answers the question "Why expand the teacher's role?" is synthesized and implications are drawn for future operation of schools, school districts, and other educational agencies.

Fulfilling the Promise: A Fresh Look at Collaboration and Resource Sharing in Education

Three crucial factors which have inhibited past school improvement efforts are analyzed in this paper. These factors include: (1) promising more than can be delivered; (2) failing to effectively deal with the reality of limited resources; and 3) failing to recognize and initiate opportunities for collaboration and resource sharing. The paper specifically focuses on the promise of the third factor—collaboration and resource sharing—to illustrate its tremendous potential for improving the quality of education for America's youth. Three case studies of comprehensive, successful collaborative arrangements serve as illustrations.

Educational Leadership Through Proactive Planning

A model of proactive planning is presented in this paper which incorporates the latest research findings related to: (1) environmental scanning (external); (2) long-range planning (internal); (3) strategic planning; and (4) educational management. Proactive planning as it occurs in the private sector is analyzed and valuable lessons which can be learned by educational leaders are underscored. The focus of the paper is on creating a vision as a leader's first role, followed by attracting people who can help realize that vision and share responsibility for achieving it.

These materials represent a sweep of emerging, dynamic, and "cutting edge" topics. The research bases are, as yet, unformed and incomplete. Therefore, the emphasis throughout the three products is on successful practices, success models, and case studies. We anticipate that these practices will become the core foundation of future research studies.

Joseph T. Pascarelli

November 1985

I. INTRODUCTION

In the decades since World War II, two inescapable facts stand out: (1) our country has become influenced by and dependent on events occurring around the world to an extent undreamed of before the second World War; and (2) our resources have become severely limited as never before. These facts have dramatically changed our national policies, both foreign and domestic. In education, the impact is obvious. Some examples: The orbiting of the Russian sputnik in 1957 brought immediate repercussions to American education, especially in the areas of science and math. Then, the influx of immigrants and refugees resulted in a bilingual focus to education, a focus which also brought with it immediate and widespread controversy. The increase in immigrant minority populations brought different aculturation patterns and different needs for services, many of which were deemed the responsibility of the schools. Meanwhile, the Vietnam war and the Arab oil embargo of 1973 seared into the American consciousness the consequences of limited resources, a fact which seemed to abort the momentum to improve the quality of education. The women's movement brought its own set of problems--women who once stayed home to raise children were now entering the work force in droves--another fact which had tremendous impact on schools by bringing into question the extent and limitations of the schools' responsibilities. Not only were there fewer workers to recruit as volunteers and aides (markedly limiting the school's human resource pool), but many children were now going home from school to empty houses.

We add to all this turmoil the massive population changes within school districts which resulted in schools opening, closing, or consolidating. These stresses (many of them related to funding) continued to pile up until there was a pervasive and pernicious feeling among the American public that their schools were in a rapid state of decline.

Throughout these turbulent times, citizens continued to express disenchantment with efforts to improve their schools. There were even those individuals who would not have considered it a catastrophe if the public school system went by the boards. In essence, the American public was saying, "Why pour more billions into our schools when the billions spent by the "Great Society" seem to have had little of the desired effects?"

The American school system is an easy target and common scapegoat when we look at what ails our society. Nevertheless, many people involved in the schooling process cannot deny that, as educators, we are at least partially to blame for what has happened to education today.

Resurgence of Interest in Education

Since the early 1980s, education is, once again, receiving increased attention and scrutiny by the American public. Renewed efforts are being made to improve the nation's school system. What accounts for this revival of interest? Here again, events beyond our control play a significant role. Our leadership on the international economic scene is being called into question, particularly from Japan to whose educational system ours is being unfavorably compared. There is also the concern that our armed services have become vulnerable because the quality of

recruits has been lowered; that is, today's recruits tend to lack the basic educational skills appropriate to effective use of ever-increasing levels of sophisticated weaponry. Citizens are asking, "How can we be the major support of the free world when our own armed services cannot depend on adequately educated recruits?"

Three Factors That Have Inhibited Past School Improvement Efforts

This renewed interest in improving our schools is both an opportunity and a danger. It is an opportunity precisely because there is again the recognition that something must be done. It is a danger because it confronts us with the question: have we learned what we needed to learn from past mistakes? It is beyond the scope of this paper to list and discuss past errors. We shall restrict ourselves to what we consider the three most crucial factors that have inhibited school improvement efforts in the past: (1) promising more than we can deliver; (2) failing to effectively deal with the reality of limited resources; and (3) failing to recognize and initiate opportunities for collaboration and resource sharing.

The intent of this paper is to analyze the three interrelated factors as they continue to affect educational improvement efforts. More specifically, we intend to focus on the promise of the third factor—collaboration and resource sharing—to illustrate its tremendous potential for improving the quality of education for America's youth.

In the next section, we set the stage for our discussion by putting collaboration and resource sharing into context.

II. THE CONTEXT OF COLLABORATION AND RESOURCE SHARING

Educators today are not totally unfamiliar with the notions of collaboration and resource sharing. Indeed, many are knowledgeable about and skilled in the processes involved in collaboration and have initiated such programs in the past. Unfortunately, too few of these ventures succeeded and many school people came to the conclusion that the meager results and inherent frustrations were simply not worth the effort. On the other hand, some programmatic attempts at collaboration have been moderately successful and are still in operation; for example, predominant types of collaborations currently in existence include:

- State-mandated special district systems and education service agencies
- Cooperatives formed by the initiation of local districts
- Regional or decentralized state education agency systems providing no direct services
- Other interorganizational structures

Many education service districts (ESDs) and school consortia continue to share and develop their resources, albeit within a limited range. However, as we will show, most collaborative efforts in education do not reach their full potential; they do not look at the bigger context of resource sharing. In other words, most collaboratives do not capitalize on the abundant wealth of resources provided by their own communities. True collaboration involves shared decision making; equal and voluntary participation of collaborating members; interdependence; and a common understanding of purpose. True collaboration also involves resource

sharing by a number of diverse, participating agencies; group problem solving; program development; and service delivery. Many past efforts to collaborate failed or did not reach complete success because some or all of these factors were not carefully considered in the design or conduct of the collaborative. In Section V, we list these and other factors of successful collaboration in a checklist format.

In the past ten years, interagency collaboration has been given special attention as a process through which community resources can be identified and consolidated. One such effort and an example of past collaborative attempts is PL 94-142. Analyzing this effort helps to more fully understand the nature of collaboration. PL 94-142 was the direct result of a pressing need to capitalize on the largest number of resources at the smallest possible cost to provide services for handicapped students. As one example of collaboration, PL 94-142 gave license and impetus to special education to develop formal linkages and relationships with other agencies and organizations. Indeed, the Office of Special Education and the Office of Civil Rights issued their "Memorandum of Understanding" in which activities were coordinated in four areas: enforcement, data collection, policy development, and technical assistance to provide services to the states in the implementation of PL 94-142 and PL 93-112, Section 504.

State and local agencies were forced through PL 94-142 to identify and use alternative service delivery modes. Interagency collaboration to

provide appropriate service to handicapped students was driven by the following:

- Pressure from the government, parents, clients, and advocates to reduce costs, and reduce or eliminate duplication of services
- Need for new and improved service delivery strategies
- Need for continuing education--need for additional comprehensive services and redistribution of existing services
- Need to deal with multiple funding bases and multiple planning processes

Yet, on reflection, a number of barriers limited the success of PL 94-142 including:

- Unclear roles and definitions of private vs. public responsibility
- Lack of consensus regarding target population
- Poor interpersonal relations among planning teams
- Lack of centralized information base
- Unclear procedures for dissemination
- Inadequate decision-making skills among developers
- Fragmented fiscal support for interagency collaboration
- Inadequate procedures for handling records in terms of confidentiality and transference
- Inadequate training of service providers: teachers, counselors, social workers
- Lack of understanding regarding change processes among agencies
- Unclear standards for client eligibility

These and other factors effectively reduced the success of the interagency collaborative efforts. PL 94-142 is a particularly good illustration of collaboration as a well-intended approach but ultimately, a poorly planned and executed effort. The literature identifies similar

problems that have plagued other collaborative arrangements (see Appendix A for a review of the literature and research findings). Problems associated with past collaborative efforts can be boiled down to five major problematic areas. These include:

(1) Absence of clear and realistic objectives

(2) Lack of internal stability within participating organizations

(3) Lack of strong, competent leadership

(4) Lack of support and communication among participating organizations

(5) Ineffective planning approaches for tasks which are too demanding and complex

We refer to these five problematic areas throughout the paper as we discuss issues of collaboration and present "cases-in-point." We also present, as examples, three current models of collaboratives that have effectively overcome the five obstacles and embrace key factors of successful collaboration and resource sharing. Descriptions of these models begin on page 34.

The next section analyzes why promising more than we can realistically deliver in education is a dangerous and ultimately, self-defeating position.

III. THE DANGER OF PROMISING TOO MUCH

As mentioned in the Introduction, the first factor which has inhibited past school improvement efforts is that of the educational community promising more than it can deliver. In essence, as educators, we set ourselves up for almost certain failure when we publicly announce we can cure all of society's ills (given the time and the money), and worse, that it is our primary responsibility to do so. A comparison of education to the medical field is a particularly effective case-in-point and illustrates how other professions have escaped this self-defeating stance.

Since the rise of scientific medicine in the latter half of the nineteenth century, the American public has not once criticized or indicted the medical researcher and practitioner for being unable to cure the vast array of pernicious cancers or the hundreds of other bodily afflictions. In all that time, the public has never denounced medicine as either a failure or a quackery because of its inability to cure society's virulent diseases, nor has the public suggested that medicine is undeserving of public recognition and support because of that failure. In fact almost the opposite is true. Consider our most recent medical challenge--the AIDS epidemic. Not only do medical researchers and practitioners completely exonerate themselves from any blame regarding their failure to date to develop a cure for AIDS, they are also quick to place the major burden of responsibility on society to provide the medical community with more time, more money, and other resources to support them in their efforts.

Historically, medical personnel have made a virtue of their ignorance insofar as their responsibility to the American public is concerned. Medical practitioners do not say they can cure cancer or AIDS next year or even twenty years from now. On the contrary, they emphasize the complexities and magnitude of the problems they face. Medical personnel remind us of the inadequacies and limitations of our past and present beliefs and practices, and of the many false starts and disappointments that await all of us. Medical practitioners remind us of the need for patience, forebearance, and the long-term view. In short, scientific medicine is saying: We will do our best, but we need your support and patience; let us not underestimate the obstacles and difficulties we face.

Another case-in-point: When the Department of Defense contracts for the development of a new weapons system it is explicitly understood that the contractor is likely to encounter a number of problems that make it unrealistic either to specify a time when the system will be successfully completed or to strictly adhere to the initial cost estimates. We are all too familiar with cost overruns (and not only those resulting from inefficiency or greed). It is recognized that, however comprehensive and serious the initial planning, the actual development of a system and the introduction of the system into the "real world" of the military means encountering unforeseen obstacles. It is even understood that such obstacles could potentially result in termination of the contract. Yet, educators have vastly underestimated the complexities inherent in their attempts to bring about meaningful change or introduce something new into a school or school system. Therefore, much too frequently, educators set themselves up for the criticism that they promised too much too quickly.

These examples clearly illustrate the difference between how educators, as opposed to other professions, present themselves to the public. The message is clear: if we in the educational community do not alter our position regarding what we can and cannot accomplish and in how much time, our educational system will almost certainly struggle for survival. Yet, our position cannot be altered without good, effective school leadership. We are not suggesting that schools compose a symphony of mea culpas in which the major theme is ignorance and the supporting chords are depression and hopelessness. Nor are we suggesting that, as educators, we change our position only to obtain and increase the support of our various educational enterprises. Rather, the admonition to school systems is two-fold: Get off the moral hook of promising more than can be delivered and increase the public's understanding of why the problems of schooling in our society continue to vex and frustrate us.

Implicit in this altered stance is a very important message--no longer can the educational community accept full responsibility for dealing with educational problems, most of which by their very nature are exacerbated by forces beyond the control of the school. That is not to say, however, that we will not deal with these problems as they manifest themselves in our schools and will not try to seek better approaches. Rather, we are saying these problems will be intractable as long as they are seen primarily as the responsibility of educators. Just as the medical community does not accept responsibility for cancers caused by smoking, pollution, food additives, and scores of other possible carcinogens, the educational community cannot accept responsibility for problems originating in the larger society. Just as the medical community

continues to deal clinically as best it can with etiological factors over which it has no control, so must the educational community do its best with problems beyond its control in the sense of prevention. Schools of education must assume leadership roles in their relationships with diverse community groups and institutions, and clearly communicate to those groups that responsibility is a shared venture. The answer to the question "Who owns the schools?" has historically been: "educators" (Sarason 1982). However understandable that answer was in terms of seeking professional status and community compliance, putting the major responsibility on educators was a disastrous mistake. Unfortunately, it confused leadership with shared responsibility.

Examples of proactive stances in education are rare. However, one such effort serves as another case-in-point, and occurred in the State of Alaska where an attempt was made to differentiate between schools and schooling and resulted in a deliniation of responsibility. In the Report on Effective Schooling prepared for the Governor's Task Force, state of Alaska (1981), schooling was defined as the "process of being taught in a school or the process of providing instruction in a structured setting." The report noted that schooling involves: (1) a clearly defined curriculum with scope and sequence; (2) a professionally trained staff; (3) material and human resources; and (4) an organizational structure that effectively uses human and material resources. Yet society offers the young a wealth of opportunities for learning in a more informal sense--learning that is beyond the control of the school. Therefore, the report went on, "because the school does not and should not control all learning experiences, the responsibilities of the public school should be limited to that over which it has direct control." Further, the report

categorized the responsibilities assumed by a school in the following areas:

(1) Primary

- Providing schooling; that is, providing instruction in basic skills, content, and other skills designated as part of the curriculum
- Providing leadership in forging relationships with parents, the community, and groups within the community

(2) Shared

- Providing instruction in skill or content areas in conjunction with groups, agencies, or private industry such as vocational education involving on-the-job training
- Modeling and encouraging the development of behaviors and attitudes for which there exists general community support

(3) Supportive

- Maintaining a supportive relationship with those individuals and groups which also have primary responsibility for providing education. This involves recognition of value systems of individual families or culturally different groups, and ensuring that the school does not transgress on the private domain of individuals. It involves being supportive of efforts of agencies already in existence as opposed to assuming responsibilities for services in existence. An example of the latter is support of mental health agencies as opposed to expanding the school's staff to include counseling psychologists.

Clearly, this report views the education of American youth as a shared venture.

These are dangerous times for schools of education because education is near the top of the national agenda. For one thing, critics of education are again making scapegoats of educators as if the major problems of schooling, indeed, of society, are the responsibility of teachers and administrators or of their making. And proposals for change continue to assume that in the future this responsibility should remain where it is.

As yet, we have heard very little from the educational community to challenge society's assignment of responsibility to the schools for the welfare, upbringing, and education of America's youth. Few words have been spoken by educators that help the public understand we are not dealing with problems that have "solutions" in the sense that four divided by two is two. For example, are we, as educators, saying that however wondrous modern technology may be, we are far from knowing how technology can or should be employed in a school and that it is not merely a matter of engineering technology into the classroom? Are we saying that any change in education, like the testing of a new drug, has to be concerned with "side effects" and that such side effects, when discovered, may cause us to abort our efforts? Are we saying that to undertake change or innovation may cause us to fail outright or fall short of our goals, not because we lack confidence but because we are realistic about the limitations of our theoretical and practical knowledge in an unpredictable world? Are we helping the public understand the magnitude and complexities of the problems we face? As educators, we remain far too silent on these issues.

In our next section, we present the second inhibiting factor in school improvement efforts: the undeniable fact of limited resources.

IV. THE REALITY OF LIMITED RESOURCES

The second factor that has inhibited past school improvement efforts is the undeniable fact of limited resources, or better yet, the myth of unlimited resources. Educators have never felt they had sufficient material or human resources to accomplish their goals in terms of either their criteria or criteria imposed by the community. This brute fact, however, has not prevented educators from nurturing the myth or fantasy that our society does, in fact, have the resources in abundance to do justice to eradicating or ameliorating every important social problem, as if all that is required is an act of national resolve to make the resources available. Today, thoughtful educators have come to several conclusions. First, schools and school personnel will always be faced with the reality of limited resources. Second, even if billions of dollars were to be made available tomorrow for improving our schools, that fact alone would not produce the desired results. Third, and implied in the second, although no one can deny that increased funding is both necessary and crucial, money is but one resource in short supply. The chart on the next page (Figure 1) displays the characteristics of educators who fail to deal with the reality of limited resources and the behavioral shifts that occur when educators learn to use resources to their fullest extent.

Figure 1

Characteristics of Educators who Fail to Deal with the Reality of Limited Resources	Shifts in Behavior when Educators Effectively Deal With the Reality of Limited Resources
Behave in isolated and fragmented ways based on autonomy of a service unit	Reach out for assistance; connect with others; form interrelated groups and networks
Behave in linear, bureaucratic ways	Span school, district, and state boundaries; cut across role groups and units to obtain the very best in human and material resources
Believe the answer to school problems lies in increased salaries and additional resources	Engage in and promote professional training and development
Neglect to inform the public about what can realistically be accomplished with available resources	Tell the public: "With $___, we can do this; with additional $ we can do this, but since we have $___, we can only do this"
Neglect to engage others outside the service unit in school programs and activities	Involve the PTA, local business groups, and other community agencies in school programs and activities including classroom instruction
Believe successful change and innovation is too costly and too time-consuming	Find other community resources to co-support school improvement efforts; streamline tasks and make goals attainable
Play to tightly defined roles	Expand role definitions and responsibilities (for example, involving school administrators in classroom instruction)
Neglect to use resources to maximum advantage; allocate resources in binding, inflexible ways	Use people, materials, and processes to greatest extent in creative and risk-taking ways (for example, use students to help inform and maintain communication with the public)
Talk in terms of specific budget cuts for specific programs	Involve multiple layers of the community in decisions regarding financial cutbacks; clearly communicate what can and cannot be accomplished with available resources
Establish short-sighted, singular-focused programs	Emphasize foresight, long-range consequences, and flexibility
View pieces of work as neat and tight little packages	Search for interrelationships with other units and agencies
Insist on uniformity of procedures and behaviors	Encourage and model diversity
Stress the independent nature of the service unit	Orchestrate highly interactive communications within and outside the service unit
Defend activities based on limitations of resources and enormity of task	Devise new ways to address the task; reshape and realign roles, structures, and work flow

Using the chart, we can see that if educators are to effectively deal with limited, finite resources, they must also thoroughly understand the change process. School leaders as change agents, then, must also know how to do the following:

- Select and train competent personnel
- Motivate school personnel to undertake change and innovation
- Build productive school-community relationships
- Adapt more realistic time perspectives for change to occur
- Gain consensus about and commitment to educational goals
- Forge more productive and collegial relationships within a school and school system
- Create forums and vehicles to facilitate discussion and air controversy
- Compensate for the fact that resources will <u>always</u> be limited

A case-in-point here is the Alaska Model Curriculum Guide Project (1983-85) which sought to overcome the reality of finite resources. The mission of the project was to develop a series of curriculum guides for grades K-12 which would aid school districts as they endeavored to develop and review their own curriculum documents. The overall goal of the project was to create a set of materials which districts could use to increase the abilities of students in Alaska to learn, think, and perform as informed and productive citizens. The model guides were not intended to be used directly by teachers for instructional purposes, but rather to be used by district curriculum staff as a base or point of departure. In 1983-84, the Department of Education staff tapped into the expertise of a wide variety of school personnel to develop the first drafts of the guides, including teachers in Alaska, professional organizations, and school administrators. Then, an extensive review and revision process

was conducted in 1984-85. School districts, subject matter associations, other professional associations, as well as any interested individuals provided input to a revision process that was contracted to a regional research and development laboratory. A panel of nationally recognized curriculum specialists assisted in the review of each content area.

The Alaska State Board of Education underscored the fact that the partnership that formed among the state, local school districts, and other community and professional organizations was crucial to the success of the project. The Department of Education continues to provide opportunities for continuous collaboration with those interested in the further development and refinement of the entire series of curriculum guides. The Alaska Model Curriculum Guide Project overcame the obstacle of limited resources through the following efforts:

- Tapping into the expertise of a wide range of resource people to develop the guides, including state department staff, curriculum people from local districts, individual teachers, professional associations, content area associations, nationally recognized experts, a regional R&D laboratory, and all interested persons
- Promoting individual variation while stressing the collective responsibility for educating all students in Alaska
- Providing opportunities for continuous collaboration among various agencies, organizations, and individuals
- Using the teachers as "content experts" and as a starting point in the development of the guides

Section V looks at the third factor of collaboration and resource sharing and discusses its tremendous potential for improving the quality of education in America.

V. THE BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION AND RESOURCE SHARING

The third and final factor that has inhibited past school improvement efforts and the major focus of this paper can be framed in the form of several seemingly basic questions: Why is it so infrequent that among teachers within a school there is relatively little resource sharing and exchange while at the same time it can be demonstrated that one teacher has a resource (technique, knowledge, style) that another teacher needs and vice versa? Why is it even less frequent that resource sharing and exchange within the same system (for example, in the same or adjacent geographical area) takes place? And why is it so rare for resource sharing and exchange between contiguous school systems to take place? The three questions reduce to one: What is it that we have that others need, what do they have that we need, and can we devise a quid pro quo system that benefits those who would engage in the exchange? In other words, how can schools be helped to understand the benefits of collaboration and resource sharing? A discussion of these concepts is warranted here.

First, what do we mean by collaboration, resource sharing and exchange? One definition of collaboration and the one we accept for purposes of this paper states that collaboration is ". . .the process of working together to solve problems and act on the solutions under circumstances where all parties believe that a mutually agreeable solution is possible and that the quality of its implementation, as well as the level of satisfaction they will experience, will be improved by virtue of engaging in the process" (Crandall 1977). In other words, when individuals and

organizations commit themselves to the process of working together to achieve common goals, they will derive mutual benefits and satisfactions.

A case-in-point: Preparing young people for the work force of the future is one of society's charges to schools. Yet changes in the types of jobs performed as well as overall changes in our country's economic structure have meant existing delivery systems for employment training are no longer adequate. To bridge the gap between the skills of today's young people and the future demands of business and industry calls for new systems and innovative delivery systems of employment training. A number of major systems in our culture currently work with and prepare people for work, including schools, vocational education programs, the military, JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act) programs, universities, apprenticeship programs, community colleges, proprietary or independent schools, correctional institutions, and other such deliverers of employment training.

Yet to date, the separate delivery systems have operated as independent, autonomous units, and essentially have not been efficient or effective in reaching the common goal of preparing an adequately trained work force for the future. Rapid changes in our society and limited resources mean independent systems no longer have the luxury of operating in isolation from each other; collaborative efforts need to be established to make every possible resource available to every citizen.

A planned approach to coordinate the employment training delivery systems would result in the following:

- Competition would be reduced and cooperation encouraged.

- The quality and relevance of employment training would be enhanced.
- Employment training programs would be more accessible and available.
- The efficiency of employment training would be extended.
- Ongoing planning and evaluation of the entire system would be facilitated and extended.

Moving Toward Collaboration and Resource Sharing

On the next page is a checklist (Figure 2) for educators to use as they move from independent, reactive modes to more productive, collaborative modes. Fifteen factors have been extracted from the literature and research findings as the critical elements of successful collaboration. Each of these factors needs to be accounted for in participating organizations if the organizations are to reach success in their collaborative efforts.

Implementing Collaboration and Resource Sharing

What is required for schools and districts to successfully collaborate and share resources? Here again, another case-in-point serves as a helpful example. On Long Island in New York is a middle school of six hundred students. Three hundred of these students spend several hours each week in a helping capacity with various handicapped people such as infirm older people and children with cerebral-palsy and other disorders. Connected with this experience (which is voluntary) are small seminars which serve to make the experience an intellectual-educational one in the sense that the students are helped to understand both the nature of these human conditions and the social institutions which have been developed to care for handicapped and afflicted persons. In short, the field experience is justified on more grounds than that the students

Figure 2

Factors Contributing to the Success of Collaboration: A Checklist

Successful collaboration involves:	This factor has been accounted for: YES	NO
(1) Effective and thorough planning	___	___
(2) Shared decision making; group problem solving	___	___
(3) Equal and voluntary participation	___	___
(4) Common understanding of purpose	___	___
(5) Adequate time to carry out tasks	___	___
(6) Open and continuous communication	___	___
(7) Trust and openness among participating agencies	___	___
(8) Clarity regarding potential barriers to collaboration, such as underestimating the time required, failing to engage in adequate planning, or losing organizational autonomy and program visibility	___	___
(9) Individual benefits as well as whole group benefits	___	___
(10) Commitment of participants with opportunities for follow-through	___	___
(11) Clarity of intent, division of labor and clear rewards	___	___
(12) Highly competent leadership by persons not already overextended	___	___
(13) Internal stability that encourages participating agencies to take risks	___	___
(14) Development of an action plan	___	___
(15) Energy to sustain progress during setbacks and conflicts	___	___

are simply involved in "helping." The program has been in existence for a number of years and has worked so well that community agencies would be willing to take on more students; in other words, participating agencies truly find these students helpful. The program was initiated by a principal who looked on his students as assets who could be developed in

ways of mutual benefit to themselves and others. The principal redefined these students as potential assets. This process of redefining is crucial to the success of resource sharing. Middle school students are ordinarily not viewed as assets but rather as passive learners who, so to speak, must be shielded from the community of which they are a part. To see these students in another light requires both imagination and courage. Redefining is only a first step. The second step in this case required that the principal understand the community intimately, to the point where he knew what the needs of the different social agencies were, as well as the needs of the agency administrators.

This was a principal who was consistently scanning the community to determine how he could match his needs and assets with those of the social service agencies. The principal had an excellent standing in the community because he had made it his responsibility to be a part of (and to be seen as a part of) his community. In addition, he was someone who held the relationship between school and community in high regard—someone who would not put that relationship in danger with a program that was not carefully thought through and supervised.

In short, this particular school principal was able to initiate and sustain the program because he possessed some important characteristics:

(1) He was a leader capable of redefining people (students and teachers) as assets. He was also one who was able to redefine the relationships between school and community.

(2) He understood that some students had needs which were not being met through traditional classroom experiences.

(3) He knew that social agencies had needs that could not be met by existing personnel and budgetary constraints.

(4) He had grasped the significance of resource sharing--"What do I need that these agencies have, and what do they need that I can provide?"

(5) He was constantly scanning the community to find ways to collaborate and share resources with existing agencies.

(6) He understood that for the program to be successful it was crucial that students, parents, teachers, and agency personnel understand the need and basis for cooperation and collaboration.

This case-in-point underscores leadership as an integral factor in successful collaboration. Let's look at another case-in-point which illustrates what happens when leadership for cooperation and collaboration does not derive from an understanding of resource sharing. The education editor of a major newspaper interviewed a dean at a university in New York. At issue was the deplorable state of science education in middle and high schools (public and private). At one point the interviewer asked, "What is the university doing to be helpful?" The dean described a summer program in which black students from a middle school in the Bronx worked with faculty doing research in the laboratory. These particular students were performing at grade level; that is, they were not exceptional students.

The dean went on to describe the "transformation" of these students in terms of interest and motivation. From the dean's standpoint, the significance of the program was that it suggested different learning experiences should be made available inside the schools. That schools do not possess (and never will) research laboratories of the type found in universities and should not be expected to have such "real" laboratories, was nowhere in the thinking of this well-intentioned academic. Instead of concluding that schools need to forge cooperative and collaborative relationships with settings outside of schools (which literally abound in

the area) and that new leadership is needed to build these extended school-community relationships, the dean ended his interview by suggesting something utterly unrealistic, something the schools can never deliver. Neither the interviewer nor the interviewee had a glimmer of understanding of the potentialities inherent in successful resource sharing.

We should emphasize again that collaboration and resource sharing as a way of thinking is no panacea. It should also be emphasized that any action derived from collaboration and resource sharing will not be devoid of problems and difficulties. However, there is abundant evidence from outside the educational arena that indicates resource sharing can be discernably productive. For illustrative purposes, the following case-in-point briefly describes how the application of collaboration and resource sharing was effectively applied to a problem in a high school.

A coordinator of a community resource exchange network visited a university professor of child development to find out what she and her students were working on. The research was outlined and the professor concluded by saying that because the research would require several elementary schools, and she had been unable to obtain the permission of school officials (who have become very leary of "researchers") to carry out the research, it seemed unlikely that the project would reach fruition. The coordinator then asked the following questions, all of them reflecting the fact that a local high school had the problem of keeping seniors interested and busy as the year progressed:

> If I made available to you a dozen or so carefully selected high school seniors, would you and your research assistants: (a) present and discuss with them the nature

and purposes of the research?; (b) train these students to collect or to help you collect the data?; and (c) give these students a short seminar in data analyses?

Initially, the professor reacted with surprise and dismay. After all, university professors are not used to seeing high school seniors as research assistants. But the coordinator then went on to say that if the professor and her assistants would be willing to take on these students in the manner outlined, he would seek to make all of the elementary schools in the system available to her. The nature of the proposed sharing of resources was quite clear. The coordinator would make available the resources the professor desperately needed and the school would gain valuable resources for the education of some of its students. The arrangement worked so well that the students were invited to give a colloquium at the university and subsequently made a similar presentation to their board of education. Funding of any kind never entered the picture.

Key factors of successful collaboration had been attended to in this illustration. Primarily, there was strong, effective leadership; a common understanding of purpose; equal and voluntary participation; commitment of participants; trust and openness; adequate time to plan and carry out tasks; benefits for individuals as well as groups; open communication; shared problem solving; clarity of intent and division of labor; development of an action plan; and energy to carry out the program.

Implementation of collaboration and resource sharing is not without its problems but none of them is as difficult to overcome as our overlearned habit to define a resource as that which you pay for and, therefore, control. In other words, no money—no resources. Here again we must

emphasize that we are not advancing the position that our schools do not need increased funding, a position grounded firmly in profound ignorance. We are asserting, however, that even with increased funding, the need for collaboration and resource sharing is not diminished.

No one really argues against cooperation and collaboration. Yet one of the universal complaints among educational personnel is that not only are cooperation and collaboration far less frequent than they should be, but too often when they are attempted, they produce contrary effects. The reasons for this are many but among the most important is that these efforts are <u>not</u> based on mutuality of needs. That is to say, the effort does not address directly the different felt needs of those who are to cooperate or collaborate. As one teacher said:

> I do not mind <u>giving</u>; I want to <u>give</u>, but I have to feel that my <u>giving</u> what someone else needs will <u>get</u> me what I need or lack. And it is the nitty-gritty of that giving and getting that rarely gets out on the table. It is not that I want it to be a business deal, although there is nothing wrong with that, but I want to be able to say that I have some unmet needs about which the other person may be helpful, and to say it without feeling guilty and inadequate.

What this teacher is implying underscores one of the most important features of collaboration and resource sharing: that individuals and organizations have assets and deficits (unmet needs) and that collaboration and resource sharing are more likely to be effective and sustained if both assets and deficits are recognized and confronted. Assets and deficits must also influence agreed upon actions.

Let us further illustrate the potential of collaboration and resource sharing and offer another example. This case-in-point stems from our

experience with four superintendents of urban school systems. We were familiar with the four systems including, in each instance, at least one suburban school system adjacent to the urban one. We do not need to enumerate here the array of complex problems faced by these urban school systems. However, one of the problems they had in common was providing an adequate education to their Hispanic students, some of whom were very deficient in comprehending and using the English language. Each urban system had hired Spanish-speaking teachers as well as English-speaking members of the community to serve as tutors or interpreters in school-parent meetings. The urban superintendents felt overwhelmed by the problems of bilingual education and the myriad of other related and unrelated problems. They envied the superintendents of contiguous suburban school systems whom they saw as having many more resources than they. That, of course, was indeed the case but what the urban superintendents did not know is that their counterparts in the suburban systems wanted very much to make Spanish available to some of their students but could not justify it in terms of budget constraints.

From the standpoint of collaboration and resource sharing the question came to mind: Since each system had assets the other could use, was there <u>any</u> basis upon which they could exchange resources to any degree? Put another way, if the urban school system could "give" some of its Spanish-speaking resources to the suburban system, could the latter "give" something in return? It goes without saying that suburban systems have resources that are seen as valuable and useful to urban systems. What often gets overlooked is that urban systems also have resources that are potentially valuable to suburban systems. Once again, the success of

such a venture would depend on the extent to which the 15 key factors of collaboration were present in the design and conduct of the collaborative.

The cases-in-point cited thus far have served to provide an understanding of the general process of collaboration and resource sharing. However, to do justice to the topic, we find it necessary to more comprehensively describe and analyze some successful collaborative arrangements that embrace the benefits, processes, and success factors identified earlier. The following section describes three case studies of collaboratives that are actively and successfully demonstrating the potential of resource sharing for education as well as other social service organizations. The features of each collaborative are matched to the 15 key factors of successful collaboration.

These "success story" collaborations include:

(1) Collaboration on the Pacific
(2) Child Sexual Abuse: A Collaborative Approach to Prevention and Treatment
(3) SUNY Purchase Westchester School Partnership

As we have seen, many collaboration and resource sharing arrangements occur in informal, voluntary ways without financial support or constraints. Indeed, many of these informal arrangements are highly successful and benefit both groups and individuals without funding of any kind. Such collaboratives can be highly effective when one system gives to another system and then receives something equally valuable in return. This type of resource exchange, as has been noted, is most effective and sustained when both assets and deficits are recognized and confronted.

However, our three case studies go a step further and illustrate the powerful potential of more formal types of collaborative arrangements--those with financial support and backing from participating groups.

VI. THREE CASE STUDIES
MATCHED TO THE 15 KEY FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATION

Collaboration in the Pacific

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
(1) Effective and thorough planning	This collaborative evolved as a direct result of ongoing work and agendas already established by the individual educational jurisdictions in the Pacific region. The separate work plans from each jurisdiction were recognized and addressed as a whole for the first time in 1983 by a formal configuration called the Pacific Region Educational Program (PREP). Participants in the collaborative include teams or pairs of principals, key teachers, and central office personnel for most of the Pacific jurisdictions that are part of the formal PREP network. Participants receive graduate-level course training, then carry out delivery of service in their home settings and around the region. This training precisely matches articulated jurisdictional priorities as well as PREP goals. In other words, heuristic planning is the primary strategy of the collaborative: jurisdictional goals equal PREP goals which equal course goals.
(2) Shared decision making; group problem solving	Members of the collaborative had articulated felt needs; they then addressed those needs through group sponsorship. The decision was made to provide educational leaders in the Pacific with graduate-level university course work to prepare them as on-site coordinators. These individuals would then serve as trainers for other educational personnel around the region and would address such issues as professional growth, mentoring, peer coaching, and master teaching. The collaborative is visible, announced, and explicitly supported by the sharing of funds, personnel, and activities. It involves policy, management, and school-based levels of education personnel.

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
(3) Equal and voluntary participation	The collaborative serves as a partnership to share resources across the region, including people, products, practices, and finances. Group members share responsibility for planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating service delivery.
(4) Common understanding of purpose	The purpose of the collaborative is to install leadership competency throughout the Pacific region and to provide educational leaders with equal and equitable access to limited resources. The collaborative began with the design and installation of three graduate-level courses addressing the topic of leadership for excellence. The courses represent collaboration and resource sharing on the part of five distinct and formal agencies that share equally in the process to expand the leadership role of educators in the Pacific. The collaborating agencies include: the University of Guam; the College of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI); the Department of Education, American Samoa; the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI); and the Pacific Region Educational Program (PREP)--a service delivery unit of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL).
(5) Adequate time to carry out tasks	The learnings derived from the three courses were built into action plans and are now being implemented across the region. These learnings have become integrated with current jurisdictional priorities which include building the curriculum and developing instructional leaders using theory, research and development, and craft knowledge. Concrete deadlines do not work well in the Pacific due to the vastness of the territory. Therefore, working in the Pacific means taking more time to accomplish goals, and relying heavily on such techniques as flexibility, realignment, multiple and alternative planning processes.

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
(6) Open and continuous communication	Open communication is maintained with key personnel from the five primary sponsoring agencies as well as with outside consultants, field evaluators, and other school staff throughout the region, including teachers, principals, and administrators. Other social service agencies are just beginning to become informed about and involved in the operation of the collaborative.
(7) Trust and openness among participating agencies	One incident particularly typifies the personal investment of time and the trust and openness among the five participating agencies. On a Sunday afternoon, six key players in the collaborative met for six hours to accomplish the following: review the relationship between the university courses and the field training sessions; analyze the effort to date including general problems, successes, and obstacles to overcome; identify specific problems such as gaining support for ongoing course work and how to tie that support to PREP's agenda; discuss financial considerations related to participants returning to their own jurisdictions to deliver service; and evaluate whether the effort had met felt and articulated needs in the Pacific.
(8) Clarity regarding potential barriers to collaboration	In the Pacific, such issues as task orientation, mission, accountability, and timelines are looked upon differently and reflect a unique array of values. Therefore, these and other similar issues were carefully discussed by collaborative members. Subsequently, these considerations of time, mission and accountability went through an adaptation phase before they were accepted or installed.
(9) Individual benefits as well as whole group benefits	The leadership capabilities of individual teachers and administrators are extended and enhanced through the training efforts as well as the leadership capabilities of the on-site coordinators and the participating organizations as a whole. Through the overall activities of the collaborative, individuals have increased their skills and

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
Individual benefits as well as whole group benefits (continued)	knowledge in the areas of professional development, educational change, effective schooling, and school improvement.
(10) Commitment of participants with opportunities for follow-through	Teams of principals, teachers, and central office personnel from around the region were actively involved in the first course that provided them with a good, sound basis of theory related to effective leadership. The second course moved the theory into the adaptation and tailoring levels, matching theory to the general needs of the region. The third course focused on the application of learnings to the home settings. Participants developed action plans appropriate to their sponsoring agencies as well as their own administrations. The third course is currently in operation through June 1986. The on-site teams have maintained their commitment to collaborative activities throughout the course work and subsequent field training. They continue to be actively involved in training others in their home settings.
(11) Clarity of intent, division of labor, and clear rewards	The five major participating agencies share equally in the organization and conduct of the collaborative. To reach the goal of installing leadership competency throughout the region, and to provide leaders with equal and equitable access to limited resources, the participating agencies share finances, personnel, and facilities. The University of Guam serves as the "mother" agency by acknowledging and validating the graduate courses and awarding college credit; the CNMI acts as a financial supporter and is the on-site location for the effort; the Department of Education, American Samoa, lends staff members to assist in the development of the training designs and to deliver formal training and instruction; the TTPI serves as the federal funding office for the Pacific jurisdictions; and PREP/NWREL sponsor the development of the courses and training materials as well as provide staff to conduct training.

SUCCESS FACTORS		HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
(12)	Highly competent leadership by persons not already overextended	Key leaders for the collaborative include a NWREL staff member, the director of PREP, the president of the CNMI, the director of the TTPI, a school principal from the NMI, a department chairperson from the University of Guam, and Department of Education personnel from American Samoa. Each of these persons maintains commitment to the collaborative and gives collaborative activities high priority on their personal agendas.
(13)	Internal stability that encourages participating agencies to take risks	Each of the participating agencies operates as an autonomous unit with high visibility. Collaborative leaders are careful not to detract from individual positions of autonomy, but rather to enhance each agency's capacity to deliver service throughout the region.
(14)	Development of an action plan	The learnings derived from the three courses were built into action plans and are now being implemented across the region. These learnings have become integrated with current jurisdictional priorities which include building the curriculum and developing instructional leaders using theory, research and development, and craft knowledge.
(15)	Energy to sustain progress during setbacks and conflicts	There is continuous personal investment of time and energy by key leaders who believe that the goal of installing leadership competency throughout the region is critical. Educators in the Pacific look to greater self-sufficiency in determining future educational priorities and directions; therefore, the installation of capacity is seen as their greatest commitment.

For more information regarding this collaborative, contact:

Joseph T. Pascarelli
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 SW Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
Phone: (503) 248-6800

Child Sexual Abuse: A Collaborative Approach to Prevention and Treatment

	SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
(1)	Effective and thorough planning	This community effort to prevent child sexual abuse was intentionally designed as a synergistic and collaborative approach because key leaders believed that: (a) there is a fit between individual goals of persons sharing a culture and the goals of that culture (in this case, the protection of children); (b) a collaborative approach provides a reservoir of personal energy to sustain progress; and (c) a collaborative approach provides a wide repertoire of problem solving skills. In 1983, the Tacoma Child Sexual Abuse Project became the Council on Child Sexual Abuse, a nonprofit organization in partnership with the Tacoma schools. All planning for collaborative activities involves the heads of community agencies as well as individuals in the community who see as their responsibility the protection of children from sexual abuse.
(2)	Shared decision making; group problem solving	The collaborative program involves professional counselors, social workers, psychologists, school and church personnel, parents, and community members in making decisions and solving problems related to the sexual abuse of children in Pierce County. The numbers of children needing treatment have increased rapidly from 1976, when 25 cases were reported, to 1985, when more than 3,000 cases were reported. The treatment program was expanded to include both teen boys and girls, ages 5-15.
(3)	Equal and voluntary participation	The impetus for the collaborative included the following: (a) sexual abuse is a serious problem; (b) child sexual abuse is against the law: (c) without intervention, the sexual abuse of children will continue; (d) the key to the prevention of child sexual abuse is an informed and aware citizenry; and (e) a collaborative approach provides more energy and more expertise toward a solution. Based on the preceding factors, it became clear that the community must unite and take responsibility for the prevention and treatment of child sexual abuse.

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
Equal and voluntary participation (continued)	Responsibility was seen as belonging to every citizen and to all disciplines and age groups. Therefore, everyone involved in the collaborative is seen as an equal partner.
(4) Common understanding of purpose	The Council on Child Sexual Abuse was formed in 1983 in partnership with the Tacoma Schools. The 25 key members had expertise in a wide variety of fields and saw as their mission the advocacy for abused children. The intent of the Council is to prevent child abuse, and in particular, child sexual abuse. When abuse has occurred, the Council looks to improve the delivery of services to the abused child and the child's family.
(5) Adequate time to carry out tasks	The broad involvement of numerous and diverse community groups and individuals has resulted in greater public awareness of the problem. The work of the collaborative is seen as ongoing and there has been a steady growth in the number of persons and agencies seeking to become involved. The Council, through its powerfully connected advocates, has stimulated the various agencies to expand and strengthen their services to the community. The result is increased time and attention paid across the community to the problem of child sexual abuse.
(6) Open and continuous communication	Communication is maintained with such agencies as the Lutheran Social Services; Christos Counseling Center; Child Protective Services; Law Enforcement; Rape Relief; Children's Hospital; Remann Hall; Pacific Lutheran University; Center for Child Abuse Prevention Services; Seattle Curriculum Center; CARE of Surrey, B.C.; school district staff, parents, and other community members, business and industry representatives; the governor of the State of Washington; the mayor of Tacoma; the editor of a local newspaper; the Junior League, and other similarly influential and dedicated groups and individuals.
(7) Trust and openness among participating agencies	The relationships of trust and openness among the various participating agencies have developed as a result of a community pulling

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
Trust and openness among participating agencies (continued)	together to solve a serious problem. Strategies for preventing child sexual abuse are reviewed by steering committees who assist in assigning responsibility. For example, a curriculum has been developed, a drama troupe has presented a program to parents, and training sessions have been designed and conducted for teachers.
(8) Clarity regarding potential barriers to collaboration	One of the biggest barriers the Council had to face was the ominous silence that generally accompanies child sexual abuse. The community was seen as the key to replace the abusing parents in the urging of programs for prevention and treatment of child sexual abuse. Schools were assisted to join hands with the community agencies to build effective programs for helping abused young people and their parents, and for educating the public about abuse and neglect. It was understood that this type of total community involvement would require time and persistence; therefore, careful strategies were devised to overcome these and other barriers and obstacles.
(9) Individual benefits as well as whole group benefits	Each community member as well as whole groups derives benefits from the Council's activities as increasing numbers of sexually abused children are identified each year and increasing numbers of these children and their families receive the benefits of service and treatment.
(10) Commitment of participants with opportunities for follow-through	As more and more abused children were identified, Council members, parents, and school personnel became even more concerned about ways to prevent sexual abuse. Ongoing efforts include development of a Personal Safety Curriculum for grades K-2; grades 3-4; grades 5-6; Junior High, and High School. With financial support from the business community, the full curriculum and training program has been forwarded to every school superintendent in the state of Washington.
(11) Clarity of intent, division of labor, and clear rewards	Individuals and groups in the community were encouraged to: (a) learn more about abuse and neglect; (b) get to know agency people such as

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
Clarity of intent, division of labor, and clear rewards (continued)	child protective services and law enforcement; (c) understand the Child Abuse Reporting Law and community reporting policy; (d) attend workshops covering identification of physical, sexual, emotional abuse, and neglect; (e) become involved with prevention and intervention programs; and (f) become part of the task force composed of agency, school, legal, business, and community persons to assess the availability of treatment and plan further community education. The rewards of involvement were clear to all: preventing child sexual abuse in the community and providing treatment programs for those children who had been victims of abuse.
(12) Highly competent leadership by persons not already over-extended	Not only influential people but dedicated persons as well are actively involved in the work of the Council. Therefore, the Council, through its powerfully connected advocates, such as the governor of the state, and the mayor of the city, are able to stimulate the various agencies to expand and strengthen their services to the community. Much of the success of the Tacoma program can be credited to Dr. Marlys Olson, executive director of the Council, whose personal energy and commitment has made the prevention and treatment of child sexual abuse a priority in the community.
(13) Internal stability that encourages participating agencies to take risks	The joining of the business and school communities in the formation of the Council on Child Sexual Abuse was an important step in the sharing of responsibilities. This collaboration brought together highly skilled and influential persons from diverse agencies that had demonstrated stability and commitment of purpose. These agencies, therefore, learned to work in concert with other agencies, organizations, and individuals to identify, inform, influence, and enable solutions to the unique problems related to sexual abuse of children in Pierce County.
(14) Development of an action plan	The action plan developed by the Council to inform the community about the problem of child sexual abuse included: (a) development of a directory of individuals and agencies offering services to victims and their

	Development of an action plan (continued)	families; (b) design and conduct of 106 presentations and workshops; (c) design and conduct of a community symposium; (d) presentation of two one-hour television programs; (e) presentation of five live radio broadcasts; (f) design and development of university classes in the prevention and treatment of child sexual abuse; (g) presentations at six state conferences and one national conference; (h) development of school curriculums in personal safety for grades K-12; and (i) provision of services to the community.
(15)	Energy to sustain progress during setbacks and conflicts	Assisting abused children and their families is a difficult job, and one which produces high stress and burnout. In order to show appreciation, acknowledge excellence, and encourage professionals working in the field of abuse, the Council: (a) granted professional awards for attendance at conferences, workshops, and university seminars; (b) joined United Way to provide services; (c) supported Clarification Groups for offenders and non-offending spouses; (d) held an Outstanding Child Advocates Appreciation Dinner; and (e) involved national celebrities in the activities of the program.

For more information regarding this collaborative, contact:

Marlys Olson, Executive Director
Council on Child Abuse
Tacoma School District #10
P.O. Box 1357
Tacoma, WA 98401
Phone: (203) 593-6625

SUNY Purchase Westchester School Partnership

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
(1) Effective and thorough planning	The SUNY Purchase Westchester School Partnership was formally established with support from the American Can Company Foundation and New York State. The Partnership represents a consortium of 17 Westchester County, New York, school districts; the Southern Westchester Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES); and the State University of New York (SUNY) at Purchase. School districts in the partnership enroll approximately 60,500 students in 120 elementary and secondary schools. The Partnership has become an active force in planning and conducting services for the Southern Westchester school districts, the BOCES of Southern Westchester, and SUNY Purchase. All planning revolves around the goal of developing an innovative program for private sector involvement in public education.
(2) Shared decision making, group problem solving	Formation of the Partnership was stimulated by the belief that restricted resources make advanced study in such subjects as physics and chemistry as well as extensive training in mathematical and artistic skills, difficult for single institutions to afford. The Partnership provides a regional approach to common needs, addresses economic concerns, and provides an extra margin of excellence by supplementing current educational offerings in the schools. Decision making and problem solving related to the work of the Partnership is therefore shared among the participating agencies and the major programs, including: a Teacher Training Institute; an Aesthetic Education Program; a Fellowship Project for Guidance Counselors; a Leadership Training Center; and a Program for Motivating Unmotivated Students.
(3) Equal and voluntary participation	Each program in the Partnership is led by a superintendent and administered by a director, with the guidance of an advisory committee composed of educators and community leaders. In addition, participants include a steering committee of eleven superintendents and four SUNY Purchase administrators, chaired by the Dean of the College of Letters

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
Equal and voluntary participation (continued)	and Science at SUNY Purchase. The Partnership is administered by an Executive Director. Through the existence of the Steering Committee, the Partnership is assured of equal, voluntary, and wide representation; there is a real spirit of cooperation among the participating groups and individuals, which is fostered and encouraged by Partnership leaders.
(4) Common understanding of purpose	In July 1983, superintendents from eight school districts met at SUNY Purchase to assess the potential of collaborative consortium efforts to solve key problems that will affect their schools in the 1980s. The schools were faced with declining student populations, the reality of reduced appropriations, and fewer teachers. As a consequence, some schools were obliged to sharply reduce their programs in math, science, and world history, as well as programs in fine arts and the performing arts. Therefore, the overarching purpose for the formation of the Partnership, as decided cooperatively by the superintendents, was to counteract these negative forces affecting the schools by sharing resources.
(5) Adequate time to carry out tasks	Five general objectives were listed in the application to American Can Company in the form of agendas for planning: (a) academic expectations of colleges; (b) strengthening the foundations of the educational experiences; (c) establishment of colloquia for school board members and others responsible for educational policy; (d) improving instructional effectiveness; and (e) motivating the unmotivated students. Flexibility was built into the program to allow the Steering Committee to reshape and narrow their objectives which would then fit local priorities and have a more reasonable chance of realization within a short period of time. More ambitious objectives were scheduled for long-range completion.

	SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
(6)	Open and continuous communication	Numerous efforts are made to obtain publicity and, therefore, commitment to the project. Publications include letters, newsletters and bulletins to the Steering Committee; and articles describing activities are placed in local newspapers, the New York Times, Pro-Education magazine, the New York state PTA magazine, the National School Boards Journal, and SUNY Purchase and American Can Company publications. Presentations are also made at state and local meetings. The thrust throughout is on keeping the community and participating groups and individuals informed about project activities as well as other regional and national groups.
(7)	Trust and openness among participating agencies	To help develop trust and openness, formal and informal surveys are made of educational needs in the Partnership's geographical area to identify subjects with which teachers and administrators feel they need assistance. Results of these surveys are made available to all participants and interested community members.
(8)	Clarity regarding potential barriers to collaboration	The achievements of the partnership were accompanied by several problems: (a) the Partnership is dependent on securing financial support from nontax sources or by becoming institutionalized as an agency to which local schools will wish to make regular contributions without state aid; (b) the ultimate purpose of the Partnership--to provide a service to the education of students--is limited as the objectives are primarily for teachers and administrators; and (c) the small Partnership staff is dealing with over 100 schools, 3,400 teachers, and 47,000 students in local schools and 3,000 at SUNY Purchase. The Partnership understands that serving these numbers with any degree of effectiveness is a difficult barrier to overcome; therefore, solutions are being sought that make efficient use of personnel hired for other projects.

SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
(9) Individual benefits as well as whole group benefits	Partnership activities are designed to enhance the skills of teachers and the educational offerings to students. For example, at the Teacher Center, teachers are provided opportunities to advance their skills in mathematics, science, and technology, as well as in incorporating problem solving and critical thinking processes in the curriculum. Teachers are helped in the integration of the computer into the mathematics program and the integration of physical and life sciences curriculum at various grade levels. Other Partnership programs such as Aesthetic Education, and Motivating the Unmotivated Student, work to benefit teachers in ways that will directly affect the quality of education offered to students.
(10) Commitment of participants with opportunities for follow-through	As with all collaborative ventures that are inherently sound, the Partnership has attracted and will continue to attract to its varied projects, professional educators as well as citizens who are deeply interested in school improvement and school reform issues. The programs of the collaborative are seen only as effective as the groups and individuals who are involved in them. Therefore, with an ever expanding circle of involved participants who are provided opportunities for follow-through of program activities, the Partnership looks to become even more effective in reaching its goals.
(11) Clarity of intent, division of labor, and clear rewards (12) Highly competent leadership by persons not already over-extended	The shared leadership given to the Partnership by the Steering Committee is a significant factor in its success. Key leaders include school district superintendents and SUNY administrators. The achievements of the Partnership directly relate to the goal of sharing resources and include: (a) the creation of a Teacher Center; (b) workshops for teachers; (c) an organized search for various funding bases; (d) plans for summer institutes in science and math; (e) external contacts with corporations, foundations, federal and state agencies; (f) survey of local interest in new programs; (g) consolidation of programs already in existence which benefit area

	SUCCESS FACTORS	HOW THIS FACTOR HAS BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE COLLABORATIVE
	Clarity of intent, and competent leadership	students; and (h) wide contacts with educational organizations and individuals.
(13)	Internal stability that encourages participating agencies to take risks	The Partnership has been able to move into more than a dozen different types of activities in addition to those originally conceived because of the flexibility that corporate funding gives it, the breadth of the original goals, and the imagination of the numerous advisers who are members of the Partnership's diverse committees.
(14)	Development of an action plan	The Partnership created a plan whereby resources would be shared across the region and would support common needs. The plan also addressed economic concerns and provided a way to supplement current educational offerings in the schools. Therefore, through the action plan, services are currently being provided to teachers, students, and educational leaders throughout the region; resources are being shared by ten school districts, the BOCES, SUNY Purchase and various business and industry organizations.
(15)	Energy to sustain progress during setbacks and conflicts	Ongoing commitment to Partnership activities by individuals and groups in education, business, and industry, as well as diverse funding sources, has helped the Partnership overcome many of the obstacles it faced (see item 8). Events of the first year set the agenda for Year II and the focus now is on expanding the services provided to teachers across the region. Other districts are now seeking membership in the Partnership. Much of this energy is directed at the long-range plans: (a) to provide training for more than 2,000 teachers; (b) to enhance learning and expand educational offerings for more than 10,000 students; (c) to institutionalize the Partnership so it will be recognized as a permanent feature of Westchester County education; (d) to secure regular funding for Partnership activities; and (e) to serve as a model for other colleges, local school districts, and corporate consortia in New York state.

VII. *LOOKING AHEAD*

The nature and extent of collaboration and resource sharing depend on a number of factors including:

(1) The clarity with which individuals grasp the potential of collaboration and resource sharing

(2) The freedom with which individuals allow themselves to become aware of the universe of possibilities for resource exchange

(3) The degree to which individuals learn to become as knowledgeable about assets and deficits of others as they are about their own (experience suggests that people underestimate their assets because they are sensitive only to their deficits)

(4) The ability of key individuals to demonstrate that the basis upon which they seek cooperation and collaboration is a two-way street (although good will is important, cooperation and collaboration only remain viable when individuals feel they are <u>getting</u> as well as giving)

And, as we have shown, collaboration and resource sharing offer limitless possibilities for improving the schools of this nation. Therefore, it behooves us as educators to discover new ways to cooperate, integrate, and redefine our systems.

Up until two decades ago no one disputed our country's leadership in the imaginativeness of our industrial-business-financial enterprise including our organization, management style, and use of human and natural resources. It was an imaginativeness and boldness that was not imprisoned in tradition or the fear of the new. At its best, it was far seeing and realistic, literally inventing new organizational means to use limited resources more efficiently, and seeking new interrelationships

(for example, through mergers) that would dilute the consequences of limited resources. Basic to these developments was how to use human and natural resources more effectively. If in meeting this problem the private sector was not always as moral and humane as one would like, it would be a grievous mistake to overlook the fact that driving these developments was the need to use resources more efficiently. However, in the past two decades, it has become apparent that this imaginativeness has been less frequent and that leadership-management in the private sector had allowed itself to become mired in outworn tradition. Interestingly, a large part of the blame was assigned to our business schools because they trained narrow technicians who saw parts where they should see wholes, who focused on the present or immediate future rather than on what was coming down the road, who seemed to forget (if they ever knew) that limited resources required a constant redefinition of available resources, who vastly overrated the "bottom line" this year as a sure prognostic indicator of five years from now. In short, leadership in the private sector was found wanting.

No less than in the private sector, there is a crisis in leadership in American education. The contexts are different, the actors are certainly different, their purposes are different, but both sectors share the unfortunate fact that the public at large has lost a good deal of confidence in them. Both private and education sectors are being seen as meeting challenges by pouring old wines into new bottles. The task for educational leadership, as we have indicated, is not leadership in the abstract but leadership that confronts the ever present fact of limited resources and seeks, through new ways of cooperation and collaboration, to redefine and utilize existing resources. This will not be easy

because we are so accustomed to viewing resources in parochial ways. That is, we view our resources in ways that rivet our attention on a system and not between systems. If taken seriously, the collaborative approach requires unlearning old ideas as well as learning new ideas, and these processes engender resistance in individuals and the systems of which they are a part. Redefining and using existing resources requires changes in preservice and in-service programs for teachers and administrators; it also requires the development of vehicles whereby those who are now on the firing line have opportunity to gain clarity about what the issues and problems are and the different forms that action consistent with the resource exchange can take. This will take time and we must avoid promising more than we can deliver in the short term. Far from avoiding this issue, our educational leaders must sedulously inform the public that in moving in new directions, the road we travel will not be smooth, that we do not possess a panacea, but that traveling that road, by identifying and moving toward a fixed vision, offers the promise of using existing resources in more productive ways.

What does this suggest? For one thing, a new image of the firing line leader must emerge. This leader is one who proactively and purposely functions as both a powerful vision-setter and, at the same time, a realistically-grounded manager of problem networks. The image is that of one who combines intuition and rationality in light of uncertainty and inconsistency, one who uses his or her craft knowledge to reach into his or her own organization for ideas and reach out to other organizations to generate new connections and exchanges.

We are used to hearing that we live in one world. No longer can one nation go it alone. No longer can one nation ignore its interdependence with other nations. But, as we are all aware, the fact that we now live in such a world has not led to successful efforts to deal with interdependence peacefully and effectively. The League of Nations, and later the United Nations, are both testimony to the recognition that somehow the nations of this world had to learn to relate to, and interact with each other in mutually beneficial ways. The results have not always been encouraging. Millenia-old national entities cannot be expected to adapt easily to a dramatically changing world. Reflecting on our historical past, a far more encouraging picture emerges from our early national history. The colonies, for example, organized themselves under the articles of confederation and then, recognizing the deficiencies of that organization, gave up a significant portion of their sovereignty in forging and accepting the Constitution under which we continue to live. Early Americans realized they had to relate to and use each other in more coherent and productive ways.

As we turn to a more contemporary perspective, we find fundamental paradigm shifts occurring that result in serious implications for our institutions. The age of interconnectedness and networking has arrived and our institutions, if they are to remain relevant and, indeed, survive, can no longer pride themselves on values of autonomy, separateness, competition, and micro-level units of specialization. As characteristics of the information society, the shifts from analysis to synthesis, from borrowing to linking, from autonomy to synergy, from centralization to decentralization, and from content-emphasis to process-emphasis are seriously challenging the structure of the educational enterprise as it currently exists.

Resource sharing and collaboration are not options. Rather, they are necessary processes in which our institutions must engage, if they are to remain responsive to ongoing needs and sociocultural shifts. More specifically, no longer can a school or school system go it alone. Better yet, no longer should a school or school system go it alone.

Admittedly, there is no one way to improve the quality of education. However, this paper has discussed in some depth some crucial ingredients in the effort for school and program improvement. That pivotal element is resource sharing and the basis it provides for cooperation and collaboration between schools and the community for the purpose of coping with the fact of limited resources. We have much to unlearn, but the change process is quintessentially one of unlearning and learning.

At the heart of the matter is the educational leader who must be willing to initiate, to stimulate, to scan for opportunities, to proactively plan, to play the matchmaker so that groups can reach new levels of professionalism that include not merely sharing resources but building and testing new practices together--to model collegiality and partnerships. It is the task of the leadership to forge sustained, mutually beneficial relationships between schools and the community. In short, we must begin the change process on all fronts.

VIII. REFERENCES

Alaska Curriculum Guides. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Department of Education, 1985, various pages.

Crandall, David P. "An Executive Director's Struggle to Actualize His Commitment to Collaboration." Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 13, November 3, 1977.

Effective Schooling Practices: A Report Presented to the Honorable Jay S. Hammond, Governor of Alaska. Juneau, AK: Department of Education, 1981, 76 pp.

Ferguson, Marilyn. The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980s. Los Angeles, CA: J.P. Tarcher, Inc., 1980, 448 pp.

Interorganizational Arrangements for Collaborative Efforts: A Collection of Papers including Seminar Proceedings, Project Studies, Commissioned papers, Literature Review and Field Report. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, February 1980, various pages.

Isenberg, Howard. "How Senior Managers Think." Harvard Business Review, November-December 1984, pp. 81-90.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. The Change Masters: Innovation for Productivity in the American Corporation. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1983, 370 pp.

Naisbett, John. Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives. New York, NY: Warner Books, 1982, 290 pp.

Peters, Thomas J. and Robert H. Waterman, Jr. In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies. New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1982, 325 pp.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971, 241 pp.

Sarason, Seymour B. Schooling in America: Scapegoat and Salvation. New York, NY: The Free Press, 1983, 187 pp.

Sarason, Seymour B. and Elizabeth Lorentz. The Challenge of the Resource Exchange Network: From Concept to Action. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979, 283 pp.

Sarason, Seymour B. et. al. Human Services and Resource Networks. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977, 201 pp.

Schon, Donald. The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., 1983, 374 pp.

Appendix A:

NOTES ON INTERORGANIZATIONAL ARRRANGEMENTS FOR COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS: LITERATURE REVIEW IN FOUR AREAS

Leslie Crohn
October 1985

I. INTERORGANIZATIONAL COLLABORATION

Key Points Derived from the Research:

(1) Tasks highly demanding and complex.

(2) Pitfalls include tendency to be overly ambitious, underestimate time; overlook planning; loss of organizational autonomy and program visibility.

(3) Collaboration not a panacea.

(4) Potential barriers and requirements must be clearly understood.

(5) Little is known about how to establish and maintain collaboration.

(6) Collaboration includes resource sharing, group problem solving, program development and service delivery.

(7) Mechanisms for collaboration can include ad hoc advisory groups (little power) to governing boards (much power).

(8) True collaboration involves shared decision making.

(9) Collaboration also involves equal participation, voluntary participation, interdependence and common understanding.

(10) Collaboration needs to benefit individual organizations as well as whole groups.

(11) Initiating organization may be seen as a threat.

(12) Participants must have commitment and opportunity for follow-through.

(13) Collaboration weakened by internal struggles and instability in a participating agency.

(14) To be successful, collaboration must begin with visible accomplishment.

(15) Must have clear intent, division of labor, clear rewards, perimeters for activities.

(16) Must have competent leadership and participants not already overloaded.

Literature Review:

- Tendency to be overly ambitious and promise more than can be delivered, underestimate time (Gross 77).

- Unrealistic to expect cooperation to solve all problems; individuals frequently underestimate time and energy required (Jacobsen 73; Parrucci 77).

- Most critical element--effective and thorough planning (Gross 77).

- Some human service organizations will fight integration because it may mean less autonomy and visibility (Kelty 76).

- Collaboration not a panacea to arrive at decisions or implement high caliber projects (Crandall 77).

- Little is known about how to establish and maintain collaborative relationships (Hall and Hord 77).

- Organizational efforts vary from ad hoc advisory groups (little power) to governing boards (much power) (Mittenthal 76).

- Distinction between interorganizational collaboration and organizational cooperation: cooperative association involves institutions serving together in advisory capacity--collaboration involves organizational participants in shared decision making (Rath 78).

- Collaboration in health services--mutual determining of service delivery needs and priorities, joint programming and coordination, centralized functions such as client intake and follow-up (Parrucci 78).

- Therefore, collaboration involves: interagency communication, mutual determination of priorities, shared decision making, and development of action plan. Definition of collaboration (Crandall 77):

  . . .the process of working together to solve problems and act on the solutions under circumstances where all parties believe that a mutually agreeable solution is possible and that the quality of its implementation, as well as the level of satisfaction they will experience will be improved by virtue of engaging in the process.

- AERA Paper--(Mary Ann Millsap in Rath 78): characteristics of collaboration:

  (1) Participation voluntary
  (2) All parties must have equal stake in activities--money, time, effort
  (3) Equal stake in consequences of activities

(4) Decision making is shared; each party has veto power
(5) Each party dependent on others
(6) Common understanding of expectations

- Collaboration must involve organized effort with clearly defined plans for action with mutual involvement from all parties (Barton, no date).

- Institutions must be willing to submerge own self-interests to accomplish larger goals (Rath 78).

- Few organizations look at what can realistically be accomplished, how much time it will take, what resources are available (Gross 77, Crandall 77).

- Absence of clear and realistic objectives means initiating organization may be seen as a threat, so time has to be spent convincing others of the need for the program rather than on accomplishing tasks (Parrucci 77).

- Resolving differences can be constructive and lead to formulating new ideas and new relationships but also reveals new differences which call for additional negotiation and problem solving (Congreve 1969).

- If organizations lack internal stability, and strong, competent leadership and are focused on internal power struggles, the chance for successful collaboration are minimized (Gross 77; Hall and Hord 77, Rath 78).

- Collaboration process includes (Congreve):

  (1) Establishing ground rules
  (2) Defining general purpose
  (3) Carrying out group tasks
  (4) Developing plan to address needs

- Collaboration works best when tasks are straightforward, and not complex (Crandall)

- Collaboration activities at three levels (Ungerer in Rath 78):

  (1) Brokering and TA
  (2) Policy development and advocacy
  (3) Coordination and management

II. USING INTERMEDIARY AGENCIES

Defined as state, regional and local organizations which coordinate and administer federal programs--roles may include fiscal agent, program coordination, funding source, linking agent, program monitor and implementer of federal programs (ex: SEAs, R&D labs, ESDs).

Key Points:

(1) Strong rationale for collaboration with intermediaries.

(2) Federal agencies rely on state-based organization to maintain distribution of power.

(3) Role of many state agencies hampered by lack of resources.

(4) Federal-state partnership must balance power and priorities in achieving educational change.

(5) Ingredients include:

- Trust in professional staff
- Clarity of program objectives
- Adaptability to local needs
- General support and enthusiasm

(6) Obstacles include:

- Frequent change of federal monitors
- Changing federal priorities
- Lack of support and communication

(7) Local conditions are more effective on implementation than federal policies including skillful leadership, commitment to the program, broad-based support, TA.

(8) Ineffective intermediaries:

- Rely on ineffective planning approaches
- Ignore local problems
- Fail to provide intervention and leadership
- Operate to meet their own agenda
- Limit staff development, cause rigidity, limit efficiency

(9) Intermediaries to be effective need:

- Clear program objectives
- Increased local involvement
- Skilled federal monitors
- TA
- Accountability

Literature Review:

- Massive distribution of funds to state and LEAs has resulted in little evidence of improved student outcomes (Berman and McLaughlin 76).

- Intermediate agencies are logical groups to bring about change in schools—they have a variety of resources and skills, areawide perspective of problems, leadership in regional

planning, ability to link resources within regions and staff to carry out programming and evaluation (Allen 78).

- Federal attempts to fund directly are impeded by general distrust of school officials for federal agencies, fear of enforced federal control, lack of specificity in federal requirements and different perspectives on how to implement change (Herriot and Gross 79).

- Intermediaries can:

  (1) Play negotiating role
  (2) Provide ready response to district concerns
  (3) Identify TA resources
  (4) Develop support systems

- Analysis of problems in Massachusetts state agency implementing Title V of ESEA: program implementers were not reformers; inadequate staff to conduct monitoring; disinclination to carry out evaluation; laws and tradition favoring local control; and federal system not able to impose federal priorities (Murphy 71).

- Factors that have bearing on whether funded programs are implemented (Berman and McLaughlin). Those implemented:

  (1) Allow for mutual adoption and meet local needs
  (2) Allow for participation of teachers in all phases; active involvement of administration
  (3) Were challenging, demanding, offered opportunity to increase professional expertise
  (4) Had clear program objectives
  (5) Had effective leadership at the school, district and project levels
  (6) Used workshops, meetings and regular publications to effectively communicate
  (7) Had trust in professional association staff

- Conditions in the local institutional setting have far more influence on actual project implementation than differing federal policies and procedures (Rand study)--local efforts make the difference between successful and unsuccessful implementation.

Alternatives to current monitoring practices--involving agencies receiving grants in:

(1) Determining accountability measures
(2) Making funding increases dependent on program success
(3) Providing for nonagency monitoring, including on-site visitations
(4) Developing TA teams to help project directors address political aspects

Bingham, Richard et al. Professional Associations as Intermediaries in Transferring Technology to City Government, 1978.

Critical factors for effective dissemination:

(1) Employing highly qualified staff
(2) Producing regular quality publications
(3) Using a variety of dissemination techniques such as seminars, conferences, workshops etc.

Organizational need to augment current approaches with TA teams.

Herriott, Robert E. & Neal Gross. The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change, 1979.

Problems with Experimental Schools Program--program of planned change failed to accomplish its goals due to:

(1) Multiple, vague federal objectives
(2) Inflexible implementation policies, relying too heavily on paper compliance
(3) Delays in federal response

Local districts also at fault: Did not evaluate specific and pragmatic plans to implement change programs and lacked leadership skills.

Recommendation:

(1) Develop individually-designed strategies to help districts.
(2) Improve leadership at both state and federal levels.

III. IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

Key Points--Improvement efforts include:

(1) Changes in teaching and learning--revising curriculum
(2) Systematic self-renewal
(3) Dissemination of R&D results

60s and 70s--improving education focused on curriculum, organization and instructional change. Now the focus is on human rights, equity, socioeconomic reform.

Change/innovation--fill in missing elements to bring system nearer to completion or equilibrium--optimal system includes:

(1) Open flow of resources
(2) Sharing of common purpose
(3) Attentiveness to needs of members
(4) Use of external inputs
(5) Effective problem solving
(6) Skill in monitoring outputs and redirecting goals

All participants must increase their ability to recognize problems and find solutions. Problems can include:

(1) Lack of practical knowledge
(2) Lack of equity in distribution of resources, instruction, materials and training
(3) Stagnating staff
(4) Isolated participants
(5) Inadequate sharing of skills

Blocks to change:

(1) Conditions in the local environment
(2) Failure to diagnose or anticipate problems
(3) Complexity of change behavior
(4) Lack of rewards

Local adaptation may be based on political expediency and involve effectiveness of innovation.

The link between research and practice must be direct.

Information alone does not bring change.

Competent TA may be the critical ingredient in implementing innovations.